

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 21 are pending in the application.

In the present response, the claims are not amended.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office rejects claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 21 over Dieterich et al. (US 6,208,643, hereinafter Dieterich) in view of Lenihan et al. (US 6,169,843, hereinafter Lenihan) in further view of Fujii et al. (US 5,898,695, hereinafter Fujii).

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 21 are patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

“determining a first Packet Arrival Timestamp (PAT) of the first information signal packet of the sequence and a second Packet Arrival Timestamp (PAT) of a first information signal packet that includes a Program Clock Reference (PCR) value.”

The Office Action, page 4, concedes that the combined teaching of Dieterich and Lenihan fails to disclose the determining of PAT of the signal packets. Because of this deficiency in Dieterich and Lenihan, the Office cites Fujii, and asserts that Fujii teaches “the ability to determine the PAT of various information signals as seen in Figure 18 and further in Column 11 Lines 10 – 37.” However, Applicant submits that nothing in Fig. 18 or the cited passage in Fujii discloses the above claimed feature. Although Fujii uses the term “PAT” in their document, Fujii actually defines the term “PAT” as “Program Association Table” (column 3, lines 31 – 32), not “Packet Arrival Timestamp” as defined in the present application. Furthermore, the “Program Association Table” in Fujii contains multiplexing information of a plurality of channels (column 3, lines 33 – 34), but it does not relate to any timestamps. Therefore, Fujii fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature: determining a first Packet Arrival Timestamp (PAT) of the first

information signal packet of the sequence and a second Packet Arrival Timestamp (PAT) of a first information signal packet that includes a Program Clock Reference (PCR) value.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination.

Similarly, claim 3, in part, requires:

“retrieving information signal packets and their corresponding Packet Arrival Timestamps (PAT) from a storage medium.”

Also claim 13, in part, requires:

“a timestamp generator that is configured to provide a packet arrival timestamp corresponding to each information signal packet.”

In addition, claim 17, in part, requires:

“each packet of the sequence of information packets including a corresponding packet arrival timestamp.”

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to claims 3, 13 and 17 pointing out why Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed features with Packet Arrival Timestamps. Therefore, claims 3, 13 and 17 are also patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination.

Claim 5, in part, requires:

“retrieving information signal packets and their corresponding Presentation Timestamps (PTS) from a storage medium.” and

“presenting an information signal packet when the corresponding Presentation Timestamp (PTS) coincides with the presentation time counter.”

Applicants submit that nothing in Dieterich, Lenihan or Fujii teaches or even suggests any Presentation Timestamps (PTS). Furthermore, there is nothing in

Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii that teaches or suggests that the presentation of an information signal packet is based upon the Presentation Timestamp (PTS) being coincide with the presentation counter.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination.

Similarly, claim 9, in part, requires:

“Presentation Time Stamp (PTS) information for determining the presentation time of the information comprised in the information signal packets.”

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 5 and apply them to claim 9 pointing out why Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest: Presentation Time Stamp (PTS) information for determining the presentation time of the information comprised in the information signal packets, as claimed. Therefore, claim 9 is also patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, either singly or in combination

Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 10 – 12 and 14 – 16 are patentable over Dieterich, Lenihan and Fujii, because at least they respectively depend from claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 13, and 17, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/
Hay Yeung Cheung
Registration No.: 56,666
Myers Wolin, LLC
For: Larry Liberchuk
Registration No.: 40,352

Please Address All Correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001